UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,121	08/15/2001	Toyoaki Kishimoto	212668US6	1335

22850 7590 08/17/2006		EXAMINER
C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND		TESLOVICH, TAMARA
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 May 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the Applicant's Remarks and Amendments filed May

15, 2006.

Claims 1 and 9 are amended.

Claims 1-12 are herein considered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Levergood et al. (US Patent 5,708,780), and further in view of Kirani (US Patent

Application Publication 2002/0032027 A1).

Regarding *Claim 1*, Levergood teaches a user authentication method for an

authentication server which executes user authentication between a [client] and a

content providing server interconnected by an open network, comprising the steps of:

registering unique identification information of said [client] with a customer database of

said authentication server in advance (see column 3 lines 21-43); decoding the unique

identification information encrypted by a predetermined encryption algorithm and

supplied from said [client] terminal via said open network (see col.7 paragraph 1);

determining whether the unique identification information decoded in the decoding step

is registered with said customer database (see col.3 lines 29-32; col. 6 lines 36-65); and

sending a notification to said content providing server that starting of service provision

for said [client] be permitted, if the unique identification information is found registered

with said customer database in the determining step (see col.3 lines 43-48 reference

""content server receives a URL request accompanied by an SID").

Levergood fails to teach the abovementioned system wherein the client is a

"mobile information terminal" and wherein "said unique identification information is

stored in said mobile information terminal and comprises information identifying a

manufacturer of the mobile information terminal".

Kirani teaches a media spooler system and methodology providing efficient

transmission of media content between wireless devices and other wireless devices or

servers (Abstract). Kirani's system includes a plurality of wireless devices attempting to

communicate with target hosts or servers and a media spooler/gateway acting as a

gateway between the devices and the servers. Each of Kirani's wireless devices

includes its own identification code (par 95), including but not limited to an international

mobile equipment ID assigned by and specific to the phone manufacturer (Table 5).

It would have been obvious to a person of average skill in the area at the time of the invention to include within Levergood the wireless capabilities and mobile identifier as described in Kirani in order to provide for users connected to the Internet and other media and document servers via mobile information terminals such as cellular phones and other handheld devices in a secure manner.

Regarding *Claim 2*, the combined method of Levergood and Kirani teaches the user authentication method according to Claim 1, further comprising the step of presenting, to said mobile information terminal, a recommended menu including site access information for accessing a plurality of predetermined content providing servers (see Levergood et al. col.8 lines 27-58 reference ""customize user requested pages to include personalized content"); wherein a process in which site access information selected by a user of said mobile information terminal from said recommended menu displayed on said mobile information terminal is registered with said customer database in relation with the unique identification information of said mobile information terminal is included in the registering step (see Levergood et al. col.4 lines 32-42).

Regarding *Claim 3*, the combined method of Levergood and Kirani teaches the user authentication method according to Claim 2, wherein, in the registering step, when registering said site access information with said customer database, user authentication is performed on the basis of said unique identification information before this registration and said mobile information terminal requested to make display for prompting said user to enter a password of the user (see Levergood et al. col.6 lines 44-49 reference "causes the client browser to prompt the user for credentials, a preferred

credential query typically consists of a request for user name and password"), while,

subsequent to the registration with said customer database, an access request is made

on the basis of the site access information already registered with said customer

database, the user authentication on the basis of said unique identification information

is performed but the request for the display for prompting the user to enter the user's

password is omitted (see Levergood et al. col.6 lines 40-44 reference "forgo the

credential check procedures").

Regarding *Claim 4*, the combined method of Levergood and Kirani teaches the

user authentication method according to Claim 3, wherein, in the registering step, a

charging server is instructed to charge said user for the use of a service provided by

said content providing server associated with said site access information at the time of

registering said site access information with said customer database (see Levergood et

al. col.9 lines 1-6 reference "a user may be charged and billed each time she accesses

a particular document through the internet").

Regarding *Claim 5*, the combined method of Levergood and Kirani teaches the

user authentication method according to Claim 4, wherein, in the registering step, a

confirmation step for confirming, before instructing said charging server for the charging,

that said user is a registered user of said charging server is included (see Levergood et

al. col.9 lines 1-6).

Regarding *Claim 6*, the combined method of Levergood and Kirani teaches the

user authentication method according to claim 1, wherein said open network is the

Internet, through which the unique identification information is transmitted as encrypted

by the predetermined encryption algorithm by a Web browser installed on said mobile

information terminal (see Levergood et al. col.3 lines 8-23).

Regarding *Claim 7*, the combined method of Levergood and Kirani teaches the

user authentication method according to Claim 6, wherein unique identification

information is read, by said Web browser, from said mobile information terminal and the

retrieved unique identification information is transmitted as encrypted by the

predetermined encryption algorithm by said Web browser (see Levergood col.3 lines 8-

23) and wherein the unique identification information is read from a flash memory

installed on said mobile information terminal (see Kirani pars. 7, 81, 89, 94-96, 134).

Regarding *Claim 8*, the combined method of Levergood and Kirani teaches the

user authentication method according to Claim 7, wherein said predetermined

encryption algorithm is SSL (Secure Socket Layer) (see Kirani par 222).

Regarding *Claim 9*, Levergood et al. teaches a user authentication server which

executes user authentication between a [client] and a content providing server

interconnected by an open network, comprising registering means for registering unique

identification information of said [client] with a customer database of said authentication

server in advance (see column 3 lines 21-43); decoding means for identification

information decoding the unique encrypted by a predetermined encryption algorithm

and supplied from said [client] via said open network (see col.7 paragraph 1);

determining means for determining whether the unique identification information

decoded by the decoding means is registered with said customer database (see col.3

lines 29-32; col. 6 lines 36-65); and service permission notice sending means for

sending a notification to said content providing server that starting of service provision

for said [client] be permitted, the unique identification information is found registered

with said customer database by the determining means (see col.3 lines 43-48 reference

""content server receives a URL request accompanied by an SID").

Levergood fails to teach the abovementioned system wherein the client is a

"mobile information terminal" and wherein "said unique identification information is

stored in said mobile information terminal and comprises information identifying a

manufacturer of the mobile information terminal".

Kirani teaches a media spooler system and methodology providing efficient

transmission of media content between wireless devices and other wireless devices or

servers (Abstract). Kirani's system includes a plurality of wireless devices attempting to

communicate with target hosts or servers and a media spooler/gateway acting as a

gateway between the devices and the servers. Each of Kirani's wireless devices

includes its own identification code (par 95), including but not limited to an international

mobile equipment ID assigned by and specific to the phone manufacturer (Table 5).

It would have been obvious to a person of average skill in the area at the time of

the invention to include within Levergood the wireless capabilities and mobile identifier

as described in Kirani in order to provide for users connected to the Internet and other

media and document servers via mobile information terminals such as cellular phones

and other handheld devices in a secure manner.

Regarding *Claim 10*, the combined system of Levergood and Kirani teaches the

user authentication server according to Claim 9, wherein said open network is the

Internet, through which the unique identification information is transmitted as encrypted

by the predetermined encryption algorithm by a Web browser installed on said mobile

information terminal (see Levergood et al. col.3 lines 8-23).

Regarding *Claim 11*, the combined method of Levergood and Kirani teaches the

user authentication server according to claim 10 wherein unique identification

information is read, by said Web browser from said mobile information terminal and the

retrieved unique identification information is transmitted as encrypted by the

predetermined encryption algorithm by said Web browser (see Levergood col.3 lines 8-

23) and wherein the unique identification information is read from a flash memory

installed on said mobile information terminal (see Kirani pars. 7, 81, 89, 94-96, 134).

Regarding *Claim 12*, the combined method of Levergood and Kirani teaches the

user authentication server according to claim 11 wherein said predetermined encryption

algorithm is SSL (see Kirani par 222).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tamara Teslovich whose telephone number is (571)

272-4241. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T. Teslovich

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER